

Humanist *World Digest*

VOL. 26, No. 1
FEBRUARY, 1954

1011 Heinz Avenue
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

COPY 25c
\$1.00 A YEAR

WHO ARE THESE AGNOSTIC HUMANISTS

PART II.

Address by John H. Dietrich, December 5, 1926

PRESERVE OUR NATIONAL PARKS

A Letter to the President

THE IMPREGNABLE WALL

PART I.

By Dr. Charles J. Turck

NEWS AND VIEWS

IDEALS TO LIVE BY

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

THE IDEAL OF HUMANISM

We are seeking to present Humanism as a religious philosophy which denies no particular faith, but which provides a path over which all people can travel toward a unity that rises above the barriers of the beliefs which divide them. In behalf of this common faith, we emphasize a constructive approach rather than opposition to traditional philosophies.

PUBLISHED BY THE HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP,
INCORPORATED IN CALIFORNIA AS A NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
FOR EDUCATIONAL AND RELIGIOUS PURPOSES.

HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST

(Successor to WELCOME NEWS)

A Quarterly of Liberal Religion

Anga Bjornson, Editor; E. O. Corson, Managing Editor. Editorial Associates: Franz Wertgen,, Felix J. Frazer, Victor Yarros. Entered as Second-class matter at the Post Office at Berkeley, California, under the act of March 3, 1879. Publication Committee: Anga Bjornson, chairman; Edward L. Ericson, vice-chairman, and E. O. Corson, Business Manager. Subscription Rates: \$1.00 per year. Advertising Rates: As space is available, classified ads are 10c a word. Address to Business Manager, Vol. No. 26, No. 1. January, February, March, 1954. All rights reserved. The Humanist World Digest, 1011 Heinz Ave., Berkeley, Calif.

The responsibility of signed articles in this magazine is accepted by the writers and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Humanist World Digest. Permission granted for reproduction of original articles when proper credit is given.

WHAT IS LIBERTY?

So many people have a wrong idea of what liberty is that we must be sure that we have it clearly and correctly in mind. Some people think that liberty means only that we are not ruled by anyone from the outside, that the ruling official is a native. Some people think liberty means that the officers are elected, and that the people vote on every question; but the most despotic, unjust, and dangerous rulers are sometimes the result of that very kind of government. Voting is not freedom. And freedom may or may not come through voting.

Some people think that liberty means no control—that a free person is one who can do as he pleases; that he is not like a horse or an ox in being held back or pushed forward or turned this way or that.

If liberty means license, the chance to do as you please, then there is no such thing as liberty in all the world. In a state of anarchy, with no laws, police, or government, you may come and go, work or loaf, steal or kill, but you have no real liberty. You are in constant fear that someone may stop you or rob you or even kill you. In a savage land, where there are no rules of any kind, or on a lonely island where there is no one to oppose you, your liberties are almost all lost; you can do nothing worth while; your circle of freedom is useless because it is so small.

On the other hand, one's opportunities are greatest in some place where government is strong and laws are many and officers are strict. Liberty, then, is **not** license. License is the opportunity to act regardless of other people. Liberty is the opportunity to act in such a way as not to interfere with the opportunity of others. When license increases, liberty decreases. It is, then, very important that all people should understand and value liberty, but fight against license and the disregard of the rights of others as they would fight against a cruel invader.

Miss Yueh-hua Chen, Formosa, grad. student in organic chem., University of California

TEN AIMS OF HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP

- 1—Full endorsement of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations at the Plenary meeting December 10, 1948, and world-wide implementation and fulfilment of those rights at the earliest possible moment.
- 2—The use of science to serve society, creatively, constructively, and altruistically in the preservation of life, the production of abundance of goods and services, and the promotion of health and happiness.
- 3—The establishment and furthering of scientific integral education in all schools and colleges so as to emancipate all peoples from the thrall of ignorance, superstition, prejudices and myths which impede individual development and forestall social progress.
- 4—The widest promotion of the creative arts so as to release all potential artistic abilities and raise the general level of artistic appreciation.
- 5—The increase of social, recreational and travel activities in order to broaden the outlook and improve the intercultural understanding among all peoples.
- 6—A quickened conservation of the world's natural resources, including human resources, so as to arrest their wasteful exhaustion and wanton destruction and thus insure their longest preservation and widest beneficial use for man's survival on this planet.
- 7—The inauguration of a world-wide economy of abundance through national economic planning and international economic cooperation so as to provide a shared plenty for all peoples.
- 8—The advancement of the good life on the basis of a morality determined by historical human experience and contemporary scientific research.
- 9—The development of a coordinated private, cooperative and public medical program which will provide preventive as well as curative medicine and include adequate public health education and personal health counseling.
- 10—The expansion of United Nations functions (1) to include international police power with sufficient armed forces to prevent war and (2) international economic controls capable of preventing world-wide monopolies and/or cartels.

EDITOR'S NOTES ON TOWARD A UNIVERSAL MORAL CODE

Ever since the November, 1953, issue of the **Digest** has reached its far-spread reading audience, the editorial office has been receiving a steady flow of favorable comments upon our proposition of formulating a universal moral code, one which will align itself with the Aims of the Humanist World Fellowship and set before our eyes the idea and in our hearts the faith during these critical times. The **Digest** acknowledges with gratitude the receipt of your fine letters. Leading professional men, religious and civic leaders and educators, have shared with us their ideas on this issue. We will, of course, very shortly present a composite of these men's ideas to the readers. Because responses are still coming in, however, we have felt that our cause will benefit by deferring the publication of this material until a forthcoming issue.

In the meantime, all readers who have not yet set forth in either outline form or in even a more concrete way—in a more fully developed plan—their ideas on the basic principles and actions which we can build this universal moral code upon, are urged to forward their comments to the **Digest**. Your letters will be given our most careful and thoughtful reading and will be incorporated into the mosaic of the forthcoming code. This is your opportunity to share, through our pages, your convictions with our world-wide brotherhood. Through your interest in, and with your comments upon, the ideas leading toward this universal moral code, the Humanist World Fellowship will advance in its effort to be of direct service to mankind.

* * *

OUR NEED FOR A MORAL PHILOSOPHY

We make daily great improvements in **natural**; there is one I wish to see in **moral** philosophy: the discovery of a plan that would induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting one another's throats.

When will human reason be sufficiently improved to see the advantage of this? When will men be convinced, that even successful wars become misfortunes, who unjustly commenced them, and who triumphed blindly in their success, not seeing all its consequences.

—Benjamin Franklin

WHO ARE THESE AGNOSTIC HUMANISTS?

By JOHN H. DIETRICH

PART II.

Now that is why these people are known as Agnostics, and just because they are Agnostics they are also Humanists. Since nothing definite can be known about God and immortality, they turn their attention to man and his life here on earth. All other religions, based upon what they believe to be a definite knowledge of God, naturally think of him as the supreme end of being, and of man's chief business to contribute to the glory of God. Thus religion was defined as the knowledge of God and our duties toward him. And since this God was thought of as a supernatural power who had within his control the course of human events, it became man's chief business so to act as to influence the will of this Almighty Being in his favor. But the moment we adopt the agnostic position and realize that there is no knowledge whatever of such a Being and that we must deal with those things concerning which we have definite knowledge, we naturally turn our attention to man. We see man as the highest product of the creative process which comes within our ken, and we seek, therefore, the glorification of his life. The prime task of religion then becomes not the contemplation of the eternal, the worship of the most high, the withdrawal from this world that one might better commune with God; but rather the contemplation of the conditions of human life, the reverence for the worth of human life and the entering into the world that by human effort human life may be improved. The task of religion becomes to unfold the personality of men and women, to fit and qualify them for the best use of their natural powers and the fullest enjoyment of the natural world and the human society around them.

Not only is this true in regard to the end toward which men should spend their effort, but also in regard to the method by which they hope to accomplish this end. We do not recognize the existence of any supernatural, because we can find nowhere in the phenomena of nature or the experience of men any evidence for its existence; therefore, we adopt a purely naturalistic conception of the universe. We do not know of any personal being outside of this universe who controls it and governs it, and who may do so even in violation of natural law. We believe instead that everything comes within the domain of cause and effect, that everything is the result of a well-established order.

And this principle, we believe, applies to the human order as well as the natural order; and that every action in each person's life, as well as every fresh unfolding of the vast panorama of history, is the result of human antecedents and explainable by human causes. Now these constant laws are the conditions which determine human life, and therefore the knowledge of these laws in order that man may conform to them or resist them as the case may be, is the foremost condition for the enrichment and improvement of human life, both the individual and group life.

Thus we adopt the purely scientific method of observation and deduction in our study of the facts of human experience, which is the basis of our knowledge and of our hope. And to make sure that you get the distinction, I must say again that this use of the scientific method in religion is in direct contradiction to the traditional method which has prevailed in the past. Formerly, men postulated a certain theory of God and of man, and then ordered man's life to fit in with that pre-conceived theory; but we study the facts of human life and experience and form such theories as these facts suggest, even though it means discarding all the consecrated theories of the past. In other words, we build our religious ideals, methods and hopes entirely upon the demonstrable facts of human nature. We begin with facts of human experience and find in them a demonstration of how human beings react to certain circumstances. We go to the naturalist and discover what he has learned concerning the origin of man. We go to the biologist and learn what he has found out concerning the physical basis of life. We go to the physiologist and understand what he knows about the functions of our bodily organs. We go to the psychologist for instructions about the intricate nature and workings of the mind—about the evolution of conscience, the scope of imagination, the power of the emotions, the authority of reason. We go to the historian and learn what humanity has achieved, tracing the onward steps of civilization—the growth of law, literature, art, government, commerce, science, religion. We go to the educator and discover how the intellect and emotions are trained and unfolded. We go to the sociologist and watch the creative methods by which defectives are improved and so-called criminals reformed. We go to the student of religions and learn the development of religious aspiration and study the forms in which it sought to express itself. We gather all these facts from the widest circle of experience, and in the light of these facts, we affirm that man is the

outcome of nature's highest creative impulse—a being, imperfect but improvable, with native capacity for the discovery of truth, for moral development, for religious feeling and for the outgrowing of evil—and we seek to build a religion which will bring about these desired results. We accept this definite knowledge concerning human nature as the basis and starting point of all our religious doctrines and methods. We see man a very imperfect being, who has stumbled on through ignorance an waywardness, sorrow and superstition, to higher civilization and nobler character; and we hope to speed up his development by changing his stumbling on through ignorance to a direct approach through scientific knowledge.

And here lies one of the essential differences between our religion and that of others. Instead of basing our attitude toward life upon a dogma, a spiritual assumption, or an imaginary law of God, we base it upon life itself. Instead of answering problems with a text from the Bible, we solve them in the light of verified knowledge of the physical, intellectual, and moral constitution of man. Instead of looking for salvation to the appearance of a messiah with magical powers, we seek it in the patient study of the universe. The men to whom we turn for help are not those who have "talked with the Lord", or who claim to have the keys of heaven; but rather the men who by searching, find out man—the men who scan the infinitely great with their telescopes and penetrate the infinitely small with their microscopes, the men who investigate planets and animals, rocks and oceans, the men who analyze human behavior in their laboratories, the men who gather the facts about the human race and its environment, and then men who sift and classify these facts, drawing from them their great lessons.

Of course, a religion that depends upon such factors for its knowledge is a constantly developing religion and must always be a religion with an open mind. This is necessary in order that as investigation proceeds, we may modify our opinion according to the new knowledge gained, in order that the greater certainty may be permitted to modify the less. For knowledge, we believe, is a growing thing; it is not a residue of thought which can be expressed in a dogmatic creed, true for all time and in all places. The assumption underlying all forms of supernatural religions is that fundamental truth is a rigid formula which the mind ought to accept in unchanging faith, and which it should hold throughout all time. For example, in Christianity, the riddle of life is supposed to be solved by scriptures whose teachings every

child is expected to master before he reaches manhood. These scriptures have been in existence for hundreds of years; and thousands of years hence they will still provide the one and only solution to the riddle. But we believe that truth is not a God-given statement, independent of time and change—it is simply the latest deduction from classified knowledge. Like everything else in the world, it is evolving; and we only hinder its evolution when we attempt to crystallize it into "declarations of faith" which we place upon an altar and worship as eternally valid.

Is there then no certainty in this world? Are our minds to be in a continual state of flux? Well, in answer I might repeat the claim that there is more certainty in the doubts of science than in the affirmations of religion, or I might say that a little real knowledge is better than a great deal of fanciful knowledge; and that the positive knowledge which we get of the world and of man by the scientific method gives a greater confidence than any form of dogmatic faith. The literature of religion is full of warnings about the dangers of doubt, about the agonies of unbelief, and the terror of the faithful lest they lose their faith; and the explanation of this strange fact is simply that the faith has no real certainty at all. Like the faith itself, this certainty is mythical; it is a shadow which vanishes in the first glimmer of fact. And in any case, it is not certainty that the adventurous soul seeks. The mind that discovers certainty in any position is already dead. It is knowledge and more knowledge that the living mind seeks, and it is in this quest that joy is to be found.

But above all, the distinctive thing about our religion is its unqualified acceptance of life. In the past, the fears and the hopes alike of religion taught man to deny life, to despise it, to evade it. The asceticism which flourished in the ages of faith, the monastic ideal which was held up as the highest type of life, the persistent abasement of human nature, the sacrifice of life here for greater blessings beyond, the prayers for help and for deliverance—all these are a cowardly denial of life. But our religion is one which says "yea" to life here and now. Unmindful of the other world it leads us to realize the possibilities of this world. It teaches that the prizes of life are for those who live, who realize their capacities to the utmost in action as well as in thought. It shows that with faith in life and with knowledge of life we may mould it to shapes of beauty more true to the highest in us than any of the visions of life-denying saints. And even in the humble walks of life, who will question the truth of Steven-

son's lines in "Our Lady of the Snows" about the fate of the monastic brothers?—

And ye, O brethren, what if God,
When from Heav'n's tops he spies abroad,
And see on this tormented stage
The noble war of mankind rage;
What if his vivifying eye,
O monks, should pass your corner by?
For still the Lord is Lord of might;
In deeds, in deeds, he takes delight;
The plough, the spear, the laden barks,
The field, the founded city, marks
Those he approves that ply the trade,
That rock the child, that wed the maid,
That with weak virtues, weaker hands,
Sow gladness on the peopled lands,
And still with laughter, song and shout,
Spin the great wheel of earth about."

And thus spin the wheel of earth to what end? I do not know. Does any one know? No. Unlike the religion of the Fundamentalists and the Modernists, we make no guarantees. If we have great faith in man and high hopes as to his improvement, it is not because we have any certainty as to the place he occupies in the scheme of things, or as to his destiny in the evolutionary process. Many may not even be the last great race to possess dominion of the earth. Indeed, there may come an end to the age of mammals, as there was an end to the age of reptiles, and man may thus in time be a subdued and hunted creature upon the earth. I do not see how we can ever know what the end is to be.

But even in the face of all such possibilities, and in the absence of all certainty as to the end, we remain unmoved and unafraid. We are as unconcerned about finalities as we are about beginnings. Life itself in the thing,—its possibilities, its hopes, its lure, its idealistic purposes. Even if we should never arrive at the journey's end, what does it matter? Even if there be no journey's end, what care we—the Quest is the thing.

"I cannot rest from travel; I will drink
 Life to its lees: all times I have enjoy'd
 Greatly, have suffered greatly, both with those
 That loved me, and alone
 I am a part of all that I have met;
 Yet all experience is an arch wherethro'
 Gleams that untravell'd world, whose margin fades
 Forever and forever when I move.
 How dull it is to pause, to make an end,
 To rust unburnish'd, not to shine in use!
 and vile it were
 to store and hoard myself
 And this gray spirit yearning in desire
 To follow knowledge like a sinking star,
 Beyond the utmost bound of human thought.
 Come, my friends,
 'Tis not too late to seek a newer world.
 Push off, and sitting well in order smite
 The sounding furrows; for my purpose holds
 To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
 Of all the western stars, until I die.
 It may be that the gulfs will wash us down:
 It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles.
 Though much is taken, much abides
 that which we are, we are;
 One equal temper of heroic hearts,
 Made weak by time and fate, but strong in will
 To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

* * *

PRESERVE OUR NATIONAL PARKS

There has been a great deal of publicity relating to the evident danger of congressional or administrative action which might impair our National Park System in the United States. In challenging the imminent destruction of our Park System, the following letter was written to the President regarding the current Dinosaur National Monument inundation on the Utah-Colorado border:

January 8, 1954

The Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower,
 President of the United States
 Dear Mr. President:

The other day there was an editorial in the **San Francisco Chronicle** which disturbed me a great deal. It revealed that the

Department of the Interior has announced its intention to build a reclamation dam at the Echo Park site in the Dinosaur National Monument. That paper, along with the conservationist groups of America, vigorously oppose this plan because it constitutes a threat not only to this Utah preserve but also to the whole National Park System, a system which we are morally obliged to preserve inviolate in the interests of our present and future generations. These places are only rightly our public domain, where our youth can commune with Nature and Nature's God.

I feel impelled somehow, Mr. President, as a humble citizen, to share with you my convictions on this issue. Perhaps I am not alone, either, in my way of comprehending the magnitude of the vast problems that lie ahead of us and the world, problems that are in a sense born of our very errors along this line in previous generations. Today, more than ever before, we are critically aware of the great expansion of population, the apparent climatic changes which are at present attendant thereto, and other resultant factors which indicate the importance of the conservation of all our national resources, especially those of water and soil.

It is said that our earth might support 2 billion people with minimum adequate diet, putting into play our present-day conservation techniques and other scientific aids at our disposal. But our population is not levelling off in number. Our recent national census estimates that we will have approximately 221 million persons in 1975. Whereas we now have available $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres of arable land to feed each individual in our nation, we will have only slightly more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres in 1975. And if we double that population again in the ensuing half century—as we will more than do, by mathematical progression—we will have approximately 450 million in our nation yet within our children's lifetime. Unless we are foresighted, unless we plan and proceed with an enlightened vision, we will one day find our beloved nation in a plight more miserable than that of India today, where there is about as much arable land available per person as is represented in a couple of city lots.

What will happen if we now dissipate our natural resources, when we reach a world population of 8 billion, as is now foreseen? Where procreation is uncontrolled, as many students in sociology and anthropology have long been aware, the multiplication and survival of the least gifted is favored.

When one reflects on these thoughts and injects a little relative thinking, it seems imperative that every square foot of Amer-

ica's National Park system must be preserved as an anchorage for our present and future Americans. And let us implant, as the noblest objective of life, the creative impulse as paramount to all others.

The conservationist groups of America, as well as the papers like the one which brought this issue of the reclamation dam in the Dinosaur National Monument to my attention, are heartened by the authoritative reports which indicate that there are better and less expensive dam sites outside this Park area, sites which will actually better supply the water and power needs than the proposed Echo Park site.

I appeal to you in behalf of the forward-thinking Americans, to forge this link in our chain of national conservation projects with the care of a wise statesman.

Humanist World Fellowship,
E. O. Corson, President

In defense of the government's proposed action, we have received the following communications from the Department of the Interior:

January 18, 1954

Dear Mr. Corson:

Your letter of January 8 indicating the protest of the **Humanist World Fellowship** against the Secretary of the Interior's recent recommendation to the President that the Echo Park Dam be constructed in the Dinosaur National Monument has been referred to me for reply.

I am sure your organization will appreciate that the decision of the Secretary to recommend this project was not an easy one to make. Careful consideration was given to all evidence, weighing the advantages of preserving this region as a primitive area against providing needed water and power for the development of this section of the country. This decision does not create a precedent for the use of national parks or monuments for projects of this kind. Here the decision was dictated by the particular local circumstances.

The enclosed letter which the Secretary has written outlining the reasons for the decision will, perhaps, give you an insight in the Echo Park matter and the reasons for the recent decision.

Your interest in expressing the views of your organization is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
John G. Marr, Director
Technical Review Staff,
U. S. Dept. of the Interior

Dear Mr. Corson:

Your expression of interest in the Department's proposal to build the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams as part of the Upper Colorado River Project is appreciated. This problem has received most careful consideration, first, because our decision must recognize the need for and use of the limited water resources of the area, and, further, recognize the scenic and recreational values of this primitive area.

There is no doubt that the Echo Park Dam would create a large reservoir within the Dinosaur National Monument and would certainly alter the appearance of the area. However, if the dam were built, the beauty of the Monument would by no means be destroyed, and it can become an area of greater attraction to more people. Neither of the proposed reservoirs would inundate any portion of the quarry where dinosaur skeletons have been found.

We have examined the proposals for various alternate reservoirs. To be effective, these alternates must provide approximately the same storage of water and must waste as little water as possible. The latter consideration is extremely important since the amount of water available for consumptive uses in the Upper Colorado River Basin is far less than will be needed for the development of the full economy of that region.

From our analysis, it seems clear that the alternate dam and reservoir sites would result in a net loss of water from evaporation of approximately 100,000 to 200,000 acre-feet per year. Even the lower figure is enough to provide all of the domestic, commercial, and industrial water for a city of a half million people. In an area where water, a perishable resource, is so precious, this is a matter of serious consequence.

There would also be substantial loss in electric generating capacity if any of the alternate sites were selected. While this is a matter of importance, it should not carry as much weight as does the loss of water under the circumstances involved here. The power loss could be replaced by steam power at some increased cost.

We share the concern of those who would preserve the beauties of the Dinosaur National Monument in its present natural state. However, as between a choice of altering this scenery without destroying it, in a basin which is and will remain rich in scenery, or the irreplaceable loss of water, it is believed this use of the natural resources outweighs the objections which have been advanced.

The Department's report also proposes considerable expenditure for the development of the recreational potentialities of Dinosaur National Monument and for archeological, wildlife and geological programs.

It is in view of these over-all considerations that it has been recommended that the plan for the development of the Upper Colorado River Basin include the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams and reservoirs within the Dinosaur National Monument.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas McKay,

Secretary of the Interior

The following letter from U. S. Senator Knowland indicates that this senior statesman might give this issue his sympathetic consideration:

January 19, 1954

Mr. E. O. Corson

1011 Heinz Ave.

Berkeley 2, California

Dear Mr. Corson:

Your recent communication relative to Echo Park Dam has been received and is appreciated.

You may rest assured that this matter will be given my further study. With best regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

William F. Knowland,

United States Senate,

Committee on Appropriations

And lastly, we have two letters expressing approval from our two local congressmen. These men, representing two different political points of view, are well aware of the electorate's justified concern over this proposed altering of—which means ultimate destruction of—this national monument:

January 8, 1954

Mr. E. O. Corson, President

Humanist World Fellowship

1011 Heinz Avenue

Berkeley 2, California

Dear Mr. Corson:

Thank you for your letter of January 11th with which you enclosed a copy of a letter sent to the President relating to the Dinosaur National Monument and the proposed Echo Park Dam.

I have already written to the Secretary of the Interior concerning the matter, expressing the views of others who feel somewhat the way you do. Thank you again for writing to me.

Cordially yours,

John J. Allen Jr.

Congressman

January 22, 1954

Mr. E. O. Corson, President
Humanist World Fellowship

1011 Heinz Avenue
Berkeley 2, California

My Dear Mr. Corson:

Thank you very much for your letter of January 11th, containing a copy of a letter you addressed to President Eisenhower protesting the building of the Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. I am conscious of the damage that would be done to that Monument by the building of this dam.

My own position is that, as a general principle, it is unwise to invade wilderness areas that have been set aside for public enjoyment unless there is a compelling reason. It is too easy to set a precedent in opening national parks to seemingly plausible demands for water and power development that would strip them of many of their primitive attractions.

While it is more costly to accept the alternative proposition, in the long run this additional cost is justified because it will preserve for all time one of the fine primitive areas in the nation.

Sincerely,

George P. Miller,

Congressman

Editor's Note:

The people can arise *en masse* and make their voices heard, that the National Park System need not—dare not—be exploited. It is not the Dinosaur National Monument alone that faces destruction. Yellowstone and Yosemite can be lost once the precedent is set in Dinosaur. Olympic National Park in the State of Washington, where tree-choppers have eyed with envy the Sitka spruce trees 200 feet in height and 6 in diameter and the Douglas firs 250 feet in height and 10 in diameter, has already been ravished in part by lumbermen who entered under the pretext of unbottling valuable minerals needed for war. Raids like these must be forestalled. While timber men and power companies press Congress for rights to enter and dese-

crate our national shrines, we citizens, to whom the shrines rightfully belong, must arise in protest. As Congressman Miller has straightforwardly stated, even though it might cost somewhat more to preserve our heritage, "in the long run this cost is justified because it will preserve for all time one of the fine primitive areas in the nation."

* * * *

THE CRISIS

These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we may obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: 'Tis nearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods. It would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated.

—Thomas Paine

* * *

THE IMPREGNABLE WALL

Dr. Charles J. Turck

Address Delivered at P. O. A. U. National Conference

The great difficulty one encounters in discussing a great governmental principle with American citizens in the Twentieth Century is that they assume that conditions have always been as they are now in the United States. Furthermore, they assume that conditions all over the world are the same as they are in the United States. They are wrong on both assumptions, and they are blind if they do not perceive how far the separation of church and state has made America what our beloved country is today—a land of freedom and hope—different even from Colonial America and different from almost every land on the globe.

My purpose is to describe the situation that prevailed prior to the adoption of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, to describe the fundamental governmental and societal change effected by the principle of a separation of church and state, and to raise the question in your minds whether the whole world would not be a happier, better place for mankind if this principle could be given universal application. I am not

now, or at any time, suggesting that the American Government should tell other nations how they should handle the vexed questions of church and state. Each nation must determine for itself how to achieve freedom, but as an American speaking to other Americans, I am asserting that in this principle of the separation of church and state, we have got hold of a principle that is not only good for America but good for the whole world, for this principle is not merely an intellectual solution of a complicated problem in political economy, it is a way of life; it is the way of freedom in the field where freedom has always had its greatest difficulty, the area of religious belief and religious practice. For here the claims of universal and exclusive truth deny to human beings their rightful status; subject to no church, subject only to the voice of individual conscience planted in the heart of every man.

I have no hope of converting anyone who accepts the dictates of an authoritarian state or an authoritarian church. Indeed, I am sure that some of the things I shall say will offend members of Protestant churches—and I am convinced Protestant members who do not see that in a free society not even the church can make absolutist claims without doing something evil to the consciences of free men. I speak to you simply as an American, as a disciple of Roger Williams, William Penn, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. I speak to you as one who believes that God alone is Lord of the conscience, and I refuse, even in this period of hysterical witch-hunting to accept any measures of religious teachings or control that were rejected by the four great leaders whom I have named. If this be treason to John Calvin—and to some extent it is—then the followers of John Calvin will have to make the most of it, for we are Americans living in a free society of free men. No theologian of an ancient day, no religious potentate of this day and no militaristic or communistic influence or force must ever be allowed to remove one brick from the walls of our individual and societal freedom.

Let me begin this story with the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers on Plymouth Rock in Massachusetts in 1620. The story as we generally know it is that these English Puritans had had various restrictions placed upon them by the church of England (Anglican at the time and not Roman Catholic) and by the King, James I, the son of Mary, Queen of Scots, who was herself a Roman Catholic and whose son James I was suspected of having strong leanings in that direction. We should remind ourselves

that the Church of England was an established church, and while not allied with Rome; indeed opposing Roman domination, it shared with the Pope complete devotion to the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings. Indeed, James I, who fancied himself something of a theologian, flatly declared, "The King is from God, and the law is from the King." Some Puritans remained in the Anglican Church of England and tried to reform it from within—unsuccessfully. Others withdrew and were called Independents or Separatists. (These later formed the nucleus of Cromwell's Army that established the Commonwealth in 1649.) Still others fled from England and went first to Holland and later to America.

There are several points in this story we should note. (1) It was the Anglican Church and not the Roman Catholic Church that was at this time persecuting the Puritans. There is nothing surprising in this because practically all governments in the Seventeenth Century had established churches, and whatever the established church was, conformity with it was demanded by the church and by the state which had established it. In other words, I am beginning with the statement that freedom of religion and the doctrine of separation of church and state was practically not known in England or in Europe at the beginning of the Seventeenth Century, and indeed most of Europe does not know the doctrine to this day. There are Presbyterian established churches in Scotland and Holland; there are Lutheran established churches in all the Scandinavian countries; there are Roman Catholic established churches in all the Latin countries of Europe except France, and in all South and Central America except Mexico. In other words, when we speak of freedom of religion, we are speaking of an American doctrine, and when we speak of the separation of church and state, we are speaking of an American doctrine. The rest of the world knows little about it.

(2) We should note that when our Puritan forefathers reached Massachusetts, they immediately adopted towards those who were not of their faith the same attitude that the Anglicans had taken toward them in England. This is a great disappointment to those who hear it for the first time, but the fact is that the Puritans when they came to power worked for an established church and set up an established church in Massachusetts and Connecticut, and persecuted those who were not of their faith. These were usually Quakers and Baptists and sometimes Roman Catholics. Now we should not be surprised at this because it was the world-wide practice up to this time (Seventeenth Cen-

tury) for a country to have an established church or priesthood, ruling and aiding the rule of the King over the people. So that when I say freedom of religion or separation of church and state, I am not talking even of a **Colonial** American doctrine, but of something that came to be when our Constitution was adopted in 1789-91.

Now there were foreshadowings of this doctrine in Colonial America and of these I wish to speak. They are four in number—Roger Williams (1644) and Anne Hutchinson (1647) in Rhode Island; Lord Calvert, the Roman Catholic proprietor of Maryland in 1649, and Wiliam Penn, the Quaker, in 1670.

Roger Williams was a scholar from Cambridge University who came to the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1631, as a fugitive from the Established Church of England and Charles I. He was, as Charles A. Beard describes him, "a pioneer among the bold thinkers of the world in proclaiming religious toleration on principle rather than on expediency." He had four cardinal points in his creed which he announced with so much vigor that he was finally banished from the Massachusetts Bay Colony. These were his points: (1) Persecution for the cause of conscience is most evidently and lamentably contrary to the doctrine of Jesus Christ. (Herein he gave what he called "satisfactory answers" to scriptures and objections produced by Mr. Calvin, Mr. Beza, Mr. Cotton and the ministers of the New England Churches.) (2) From this principle that there should be no persecution for conscience's sake, there followed the corresponding principle that no one to be bound to worship or to maintain a worship against his own consent. (3) To insure this result, the church and the state should be separated, that to limit the choice of civil magistrates (mayors, governors, etc., as was done in Massachusetts Bay Colony) to church members (those who had taken the oath of fidelity), would be like choosing pilots and physicians according to their schemes of salvation rather than skill in their professions. (4) The civil magistrate was not to interfere in matters of conscience, but his power extended only to the bodies and goods of men.

Now we are on the track of a truly revolutionary principle on which alone in my judgment freedom of the mind in all its operations can be based. And the rulers of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Protestants mind you, banished Roger Williams to the forest. After a terrible winter, he, with five companions, emerged in the spring of 1636 and founded the colony in which free-

dom of religion has had an unbroken history—Rhode Island—and the settlement he established was called Providence.

I think it my special duty at this time to call attention to the second advocate of freedom of religion in America, also associated with Rhode Island, because the second advocate was a woman. The bulwark of reactionary religious faith is always the exploited womanhood of the society. Mohammedanism, Buddhism and certain forms of Christianity are the regrettable proof of that statement. I am inordinately proud of the fact that in America the second voice raised for religious freedom was that of a woman, Mrs. Anne Hutchinson, who followed Roger Williams from old England to New England by three years. This is the description of the controversy that led to her exile as given by Charles A. Beard: "Like Roger Williams, or worse, was the description that the perplexed Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts gave." Mrs. Hutchinson was a woman of high courage, fine character, good family and undoubted ability, of ready wit and a bold spirit. According to the faithful, she brought with her two dangerous errors. (1) She espoused the doctrine of justification by faith and declared that the Holy Ghost dwells in every believer. (2) She also cut at the roots of established Puritanism, for she maintained the sovereignty of private judgment in matters religious against the fulminations of the clergy and the penalties of the civil magistrates. Such sentiments, intolerable enough to the authorities of Massachusetts when avowed by a man, were doubly outrageous in their eyes when disclosed by a woman of feminist temperament. And so they banished her to the forest, and she emerged with a few companions and began the settlement at Portsmouth, Rhode Island.

The third illustration of freedom of religion in America is in the colony of Maryland, which was a proprietorship of Lord Calvert, a Roman Catholic of Yorkshire, England. He and his son had to exercise the greatest skill in maintaining the ownership of this province, because the Church of England was suspicious of him and the rise of Oliver Cromwell to the rule in England made any favoritism towards Catholics in Maryland a most dangerous procedure. Whatever the reasons, the first and the second Lords Baltimore granted the principle of religious freedom, and there is no record of any persecutions, or even of prosecutions, of any group, sect or individual because of religious belief or lack of belief. The "Act concerning Religion", passed by the

Maryland colonial legislature in 1649 and approved by Lord Baltimore, contains this famous clause:

"Whereas the enforcing of the conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in those commonwealths where it hath been practiced, and for the more quiet and peaceable government of this province, and the better to preserve mutual love and unity amongst the inhabitants here, be it, therefore, also by the lord proprietary with the advice and assent of this assembly ordained and enacted that no person or persons whatsoever within this province . . . professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth be in anyways troubled, molested or discountenanced, for or in his or her religion, nor in the free exercise thereof." (This, by the way, is the earliest use of that particular phrase that appears in the First Amendment.)

We should perhaps note that this document gave liberty **only to Christians**, not to Jews and probably not to Quakers, and certainly not to free thinkers. But this criticism can be equally well directed to various Protestant documents which came along later and continued the discrimination against Jews, Quakers and free thinkers. I ought also to mention that the historian Beard believes that the moving spirits back of the Maryland Act were Protestants in the legislature, but the fact remains that it was a Roman Catholic overlord who signed and accepted the measure.

The fourth example of freedom of religion in America was William Penn in Pennsylvania. When a young man, William Penn attended Oxford University and came to attach himself to the Quakers. In those days in the late Seventeenth Century the Quakers were despised and persecuted. But neither the blows of his wealthy and irate father nor the rigors of the prison to which he was more than once committed could shake Penn's loyalty to his group. After his father died in 1670, William Penn found himself to have inherited considerable wealth and also a claim against the Crown for 16,000 pounds (then \$64,000), a very large sum. Charles II finally paid the claim by granting William Penn what is now substantially Pennsylvania, named by the monarch and not by the proprietor. True to his convictions, Penn announced that his colony would provide religious liberty for all who settled there. He came to America in 1682 and found already along the Delaware River about 6,000 people—Swedes and Dutch and some English Quakers. By careful advertising in England for families to come, he drew

middle class people seeking homesteads, English Quakers, Scotch Irish Presbyterians, Welsh Baptists and a good number of Germans of various Protestant faiths. These people actually lived together with no established church and full religious freedom, and constitute the fourth and perhaps the greatest colonial example of what freedom of religion means to Americans.

The next step in the development of this American doctrine took place in the various colonies from the time of their respective founding to the formation of the Federal Union. Every colony except Rhode Island and Pennsylvania had at least one established church during the period of 1620 to 1776, and in nearly every one it was the Church of England. As the colonists began to think more in terms of freedom and liberty, they began to be more restive under arrangements that barred some of them from voting because they were not members of the established church, that made all of them contribute to the support of the church out of their total taxes or tithes, and that gave clergymen what seemed to many an inordinate amount of control over private lives and beliefs of the people. In the colonists as TODAY, the love of liberty is the great force that meets head-on any attempt to coerce conscience or take taxes for religious purposes. And to meet that force, the established church in each colony had to develop a maneuver, which strangely enough is the exact maneuver which our Roman Catholic friends are working on day. (To be continued.)

* * *

NEWS AND VIEWS

FACE THE H-BOMB FACTS

Val Peterson, Administrator of Federal Civil Defense, added his bit to the general confusion the other day. Declaring that the United States is "not adequately prepared to meet an atomic attack," Mr. Peterson warned that it would not be adequately prepared until its citizens had faced the facts and overcome "six attitudes" that now stand in the way of an effective civil defense.

The "six attitudes", as reported by the New York Times, included a "universal human tendency" to put things off, a hope that there will not be atomic war, a "psychological block" that transforms this hope into a conviction, and a few other things. Our own interest was engaged by Attitudes Four and Five. The first of these is the belief of "many . . . that with the H-bomb and other weapons an attack would be so devastating that we

could not do anything about it." "To be completely candid," observed the completely candid Administrator, "there is some truth behind this attitude."

Reinforcing this candor in commenting on the next "attitude," which Mr. Peterson defined as an ill-founded faith that the Air force could intercept any attacking bombers, the civil defense boss remarked: "If we had an all-out attack against us, we might lose the downtown areas of most of our cities—it might mean only 3 percent of our territory, but perhaps 65,000,000 casualties if we had no warning."

And in Detroit, a few days later, one of Mr. Peterson's aides warned the local CD officers that their evacuation plans, based on the assumption of a 45-minute warning, were unrealistic. "From zero to fifteen minutes" is the maximum on which they can count, he warned, to which the local commander responded gloomily, "What can you do in fifteen minutes?"

It's a good question.

(From Fellowship—The World in Focus, Vol. 20, No. 1)

* * *

DRIVE AGAINST BRICKER AMENDMENT WINS NEW SUPPORT; ACLU INTENSIFIES EFFORT

Opposition to the so-called Bricker Amendment, now before the Senate, is gaining momentum. A special nation-wide organization of distinguished constitutional lawyers, prominent businessmen and informed public leaders, named The Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power, has come into being—to spearhead the campaign against the proposed amendment. Professor Emeritus Edward S. Corwin of Princeton, a constitutional historian, has been named National Chairman. John W. Davis, the noted lawyer, and General Lucius D. Clay, former commander-in-chief of U. S. forces in Europe, are co-chairmen.

The Committee opposes Senator Bricker's proposal on four main counts, stating that its enactment would:

- Make our procedure for carrying out treaty obligations the most cumbersome in the world and seriously weaken our bargaining position in dealing with other nations.
- Make acquiescence of the legislatures of the 48 states necessary to complete such international agreements as the traditional treaties of friendship, commerce, navigation, narcotics control,

and possible arrangements for international control of atomic energy.

- Enable Congress to destroy the President's power to make necessary international agreements to most emergencies, like the Berlin blockade, as they occur.

- Declare that a treaty provision which conflicts with the Constitution "shall not be of any force or effect"—this is presently the law, and there is no need to amend the Constitution to say so.

The ACLU has opposed the Bricker Amendment from the beginning—only because of its impact on civil liberties—and the Union has now renewed its campaign to defeat the proposal. The national office has called on all its affiliates to urge members of Congress to vote against the measure.

Members Can Help

All members of the Union can help in this effort by writing their Senators and Representatives. Here is a summary of the American Civil Liberties Union's position:

1. No treaty can now override the Constitution.
2. Any treaty in conflict with the Constitution is invalid, now.
3. Any federal law passed subsequent to a treaty takes precedence over the treaty, now.
4. Under the Constitution the power to make treaties (which must be approved by the Senate) is an essential part of the executive branch of the government.
5. A treaty can give Congress powers to legislate in international relations which Congress could not exercise under the Constitution alone. Such additional powers are inherent in the treaty-making powers, now.
6. The Bricker Amendment would foreclose U. S. action to secure civil liberties internationally.

* * *

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Government College,
Abbottabad (N. D. F. P.)
West Pakistan
February 3, 1954

Dear Miss Bjornson:

We in Pakistan are conscious of the great work you are doing in America through the Humanist World Fellowship. I have been thinking since long whether I could do something for the people

in my country by associating my efforts here to those you are making in your country by writing in my own language about Humanism for my people. In this respect I need your help and guidance.

Our greatest problem here is the almost total lack of literary material about modern Humanism. Could you please suggest to your friends and readers that they would be doing much in promoting a god cause if they can send to our college library, through me, any old copies of Humanist publications that are available with them. (Such books, etc., should bear the signature of their formers owners so that we don't have to pay import duty on them.)

Also please let me know what you can do immediately to have my college placed on the list of subscribers to the journal of which you are the editor.

Sincerely yours,
Rawal S. Malik, MA
Lecturer

(Editor's Note: Any readers who might have a past file of the Humanist World Digest or other Humanist publications which they would like to share with the Government College at Abbottabad, West Pakistan, please send them to the College Library, c/o Mr. R. S. Malik. It will be a splendid opportunity to extend the work of modern Humanism.)

January 8, 1954

HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP

1011 Heinz Avenue
Berkeley 2, California

Dear Friend Corson:

I am glad for your nice letter of December 9th. It has been a tough fight these past six years, but we have been inching forward every year. I don't mind a good fight in a worthwhile cause. I think too many people seek ease and comfort today and not enough of them have the courage of their forefathers to stand for principle. But who am I to speak like this to you. You have observed life longer than I, and know what it means to stand for your convictions.

I believe that a dozen copies of Religious Liberty and other literature have gone forward to you. I am also sending you one of our new promotional leaflets "Six Years Old."

I hope that 1954 is a great year for you.

Sincerely,

Glenn L. Archer, Executive Director,
P.O.A.U., National Conference on Church and State

Editor's Note:

Thank you, Glenn Archer of P.O.A.U., for your great work and for the personal sacrifices which you are making for the preservation of American Religious Liberty based on the First Amendment to the U. S. Constitution.

We are glad to call to the attention of our readers the organization which you represent, "Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State" at 1633 Massachusetts avenue, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., the only major organization uniquely dedicated to maintaining that "Impregnable Wall of Separation."

We recommend that our interested readers write you and give your organization their full support.—E.O.C., Managing Editor.

January 5, 1954

Dear Mr. Corson:

I have received two issues of the Humanist World Digest—and say, you have quite a spokesman there. It is a good little salesman for Humanism!

I have gone through the Constitution of the Humanist World Fellowship a number of times, and I dine on other literature, but for a good solid meal, I like meat and the Digest is just that. It is like a good steak—the only thing wrong with it is—there is not enough!

It is wonderful! I wish it could be put into the hands of more people. It should be on every library shelf! It should be on the literature table of every **REAL** Humanist Society.

I was originally a New Thought-er. I am still recognized as an ordained New Thought Minister. One day I shall tell you of my struggles and how and why I was led to break from New Thought and come all-out for Humanism.

My work has been unorganized. I have been afraid of Institutionalism. I have seen its dangers, therefore I have been working (almost) alone, financing the work here, personally, and closing the door to membership. All I have desired has been Fellowship, but I do realize now that more could be done if there were organization. In R. I., Peoples, is the only **REAL** Humanist voice. The Unitarian churches, which are quite progressive Humanists in many places, here in R. I. are almost old-fashioned Methodists. I attended what I was told was the most **liberal** Unitarian church in R. I. and came away almost sick. I actually expected the preacher to ask sinners to come up to the mourner's bench, re-

pent and be saved. I was so surprised. After hearing such men as E. Burdette Backus of Indianapolis, a Unitarian Humanist, and others like him, I was so very disappointed. Norman Vincent Peele would be right at home here, but enough. I just wanted to emphasize there is no organized Humanism in R. I., and I know there are many Humanists here—they have come to meetings and have shown much interest. I managed to have "The Humanist" placed on two newsstands here and they do go fast!

I am not affiliated with any Humanist group (American Humanist Association, International Humanist and Ethical Union). I have worked only under the People's banner but I believe it would be wise to become affiliated and I think I would rather work with the Humanist World Fellowship than any other. I like your principles, I like your positive philosophy, and as I prepare now for the spring campaign I would like to go forth under the banner of People's and Humanist World Fellowship.

May I hear from you with suggestions, etc. Incidentally, when I state I would like to work with Humanist World Fellowship I do not mean that I would solicit financial support. I have supported the local work up to now and will continue. This is the least important problem here.

In the Name of Man,
P. B. O.

Rhode Island.

* * * *

When you once attribute effects to the will of a personal God, you have let in a lot of little gods and devils—then sprites, fairies, dryads, naiads, witches, ghosts and goblins, for your imagination is reeling, riotous, drunk, afloat on the flotsam of superstition. What you know then doesn't count. You just believe, and the more you believe the more do you plume yourself that fear and faith are superior to science and seeing.

What I am now telling you is Science, and Science is the classified knowledge of the common people.—Elbert Hubbard.

* * *

Love is an inward emotion, and if stifled, thwarted and turned back upon itself, tends to gloom, melancholy, brooding, jealousy, rage and death. But love that is liberated in human effort attracts love; so a current is created and excess emotion is utilized, for the good not only of the beloved, but also of the race. The love that lasts is a trinity—I love you because you love the things that I love. Static love soon turns to hate, or, to be more exact, try to make love a fixiy and it dies.—Elbert Hubbard.

DISCOURSE ON HUMAN THOUGHT

The intellectual development of the human race has been suddenly, almost abruptly, raised to a higher plane than that upon which it had proceeded from the days of the primitive troglodyte to the days of our great-grandfathers. It is characteristic of this higher plane of development that the progress which until lately was so slow must henceforth be rapid. Men's minds are becoming more flexible, the resistance to innovation is weakening, and our intellectual demands are multiplying while the means of satisfying them are increasing. Vast as are the achievements we have just passed in review, the gaps in our knowledge are immense, and every problem that is solved but opens a dozen new problems that await solution.

Under such circumstances there is no likelihood that the last word will soon be said on any subject. In the eyes of the twenty-first century the science of the nineteenth will doubtless seem very fragmentary and crude. But the men of that day, and of all future time, will no doubt point back to the age just passing away as the opening of a new dispensation, the dawning of an era in which the intellectual development of mankind was raised to a higher plane than that upon which it had hitherto proceeded.

As an inevitable result of the thronging discoveries just enumerated, we find ourselves in the midst of a mighty revolution in human thought. Time-honored creeds are losing their hold upon men; ancient symbols are shorn of their value; everything is called in question. The controversies of the day are not like those of former times. It is no longer . . . a struggle between abstruse dogmas of rival churches. Religion itself is called upon to show why it should any longer claim our allegiance.

—John Fiske

* * *

TOWARD INTERNATIONAL TOLERANCE

Nothing is more essential than the permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded, and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges toward another a habitual hatred or a habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation

against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions; obstinate, envenomed and bloody contests. Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens), the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial.—George Washington.

* * *

SCIENCE AND SOCIAL CONSERVATION

LEONARD CARMICHAEL

Secretary of the Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D. C.

Especially during the past century and a half science has contributed to social change and to the improvement of the lot of many of the peoples of the globe. Pure science, technology, and modern medicine all have continuing social implications of great importance. Political and economic stability is needed to allow the further development of these benefits and their wider distribution throughout the world.

Can Science and education help in establishing such a steady and conservative economic and political life? The answer is "Yes". To do so, however, more study than at present must be given to human genetics. Scientific psychology also must actively investigate the limitations and special characteristics of human mental life which are inborn and which do not result primarily from environmental conditioning or cultural learning.

Some economic and political revolutionaries and reformers of the 18th and 19th centuries assumed that they knew all about the basic make-up of human nature. They said that man is born good but corrupted by a bad society. Some even thought that by upsetting established economic and political institutions a golden age could be established in one generation. They held that men and women need not themselves try to be good and to avoid evil because a Utopian society would do all this for them in a painless way. Some of the assumptions made by those who popularized this dream have never been tested by modern science. These unproved guesses about human nature, nevertheless, underlie much of the theorizing and of the dangerous programs of modern Fascism and Communism. A full scientific study of human genetics and of the importance of heredity in

determining the limitations and the inborn characteristics of man's mental life is thus a great need of our age if we are to develop a sound social philosophy and maintain our democratic freedoms.

Better education in science, social science, and especially in the humanities is important in this present age of atomic development and of dangerous international tensions. A proper study of the best wisdom of the past as given in religion and in the humanities is thus now needed in a unique way. By such education each new generation can learn about the value scales that have proved to be adequate in the long past of human living. Such scales can then be applied to modern problems which analysis will often show are old human questions decked out in new clothes.

Thus man, in many ways an ancient mammal with fixed brain capacity, can learn how to maintain a conservative, democratic, law-based social order which will nevertheless allow each individual to achieve and enjoy the fullest personal freedom of which he is capable.

(Abstract of the 14th annual Phi Beta Kappa address, delivered before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Boston, Dec. 30, 1953.)

* * *

THE GOLDEN RULE

Christianity: All things whatsoever that ye would that men should do to you, do ye so to them; for this is the Law and the Prophets.

Judaism: What is hateful to you, do not to your fellowman. That is the entire Law; all the rest is commentary.

Buddhism: Hurt not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful.

Islam: No one of you is a believer until he desires for his brother that which he desires for himself.

Brahmanism: That is the sum of duty: Do naught unto others which would cause you pain if done to you.

Confucianism: Is there one maxim which ought to be acted upon throughout one's whole life? Surely it is the maxim of loving kindness: Do not unto others what you would not have them do unto you.

Taoism: Regard your neighbor's gain as your own gain, and your neighbor's loss as your own loss.

Zoroastrianism: That nature alone is good which refrains from doing unto others whatsoever is not good for itself.

MANAGING EDITOR'S COLUMN

For ages, a deadly conflict has been waged between a few brave men and women of thought and genius upon the one side, and the great ignorant religious mass on the other. This is the war between Science and Faith. The few have appealed to reason, to honor, to law, to freedom, to the known, and to happiness here in this world. The many have appealed to prejudice, to fear, to miracle, to slavery, to the unknown, and to misery hereafter. The few have said, "Think!" The many have said, "Believe!"—Robert Ingersoll.

Again in this issue we endeavor to present a digest of materials for those who think. You can help spread the word of the work of this magazine by passing it on to a friend when you are through with it.

Also send us a list of those whom you believe might be interested in learning more about it.

Your cooperation will be most helpful and greatly appreciated.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Please enter my subscription to the Humanist World Digest foryears at \$1.00 per year. \$..... enclosed herewith.

Please send information on how to become a member or form a chapter of the Humanist World Fellowship.....(Check)

NAME

ADDRESS

(Please type or print)

Add additional names on a separate sheet.

Mail to: **HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST**

1011 Heinz Avenue

Berkeley 2, California

INTERPRETING HUMANIST OBJECTIVES

HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP is a religious association incorporated under the laws of the State of California with all the rights and privileges of such organizations. It enrolls members, charters local societies, affiliates like-minded groups, establishes educational projects and ordains ministers.

HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP defines religion in terms of two inseparable historical processes: (1) the ages-long quest for ultimate human values; and (2) the continuous effort to realize these values in individual experience and in just and harmonious social relations. Humanism affirms the inviolable dignity of the individual and declares democracy the only acceptable method of social progress.

MODERN HUMANISM seeks to unite the whole of mankind in ultimate religious fellowship. It strives for the integration of the whole personality and the perfection of social relationships as the objectives of religious effort. Humanism, in broad terms, tries to achieve a good life in a good world. **HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** is a shared quest for that good life.

Above all, man is not to be regarded as an instrument that serves and glorifies totalitarianism — economic, political or theocratic.

HUMANISM insists that man is the highest product of the creative process within our knowledge, and as such commands our highest allegiance. He is the center of our concern. He is not to be treated as a means to some other end, but as an end in himself. Heretofore man has been considered a means to further the purposes of gods, states, economic systems, social organizations; but Humanism would reverse this and make all these things subservient to the fullest development of the potentialities of human nature as the supreme end of all endeavor. This is the cornerstone of Humanism, which judges all institutions according to their contribution to human life.

HUMANISM recognizes that all mankind are brothers with a common origin. We are all of one blood with common interests and a common life and should march with mutual purposes toward a common goal. This means that we must eradicate racial antagonisms, national jeal-

ousies, class struggles, religious prejudices and individual hatreds. Human solidarity requires that each person consider himself a cooperating part of the whole human race striving toward a commonwealth of man built upon the principles of justice, good will and service.

HUMANISM seeks to understand human experience by means of human inquiry. Despite the claims of revealed religions, all of the real knowledge acquired by the race stems from human inquiry. Humanists investigate facts and experience, verify these, and formulate thought accordingly. However, nothing that is human is foreign to the Humanist. Institutions, speculations, supposed supernatural revelations are all products of some human mind so must be understood and evaluated. The whole body of our culture — art, poetry, literature, music, philosophy and science must be studied and appreciated in order to be understood and appraised.

HUMANISM has no blind faith in the perfectibility of man but assumes that his present condition, as an individual and as a member of society, can be vastly improved. It recognizes the limitations of human nature but insists upon developing man's natural talents to their highest point. It asserts that man's environment, within certain limits, can be arranged so as to enhance his development. Environment should be brought to bear on our society so as to help to produce healthy, sane, creative, happy individuals in a social structure that offers the most opportunity for living a free and full life.

HUMANISM accepts the responsibility for the conditions of human life and relies entirely upon human efforts for their improvement. Man has made his own history and he will create his own future—for good or ill. The Humanist determines to make this world a fit place to live in and human life worth living. This is a hard but challenging task. It could result gloriously.

These brief paragraphs indicate the objectives and methods of **HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** as a religious association. Upon the basis of such a program it invites all like-minded people into membership and communion. Let us go forward together.

Josiah R. Bartlett
2461 LaConte Ave.
Berkeley 8, Calif. (e)